UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,973	12/05/2001	Paul R. Nash	41003.P086X	8414

25943 7590 02/15/2005

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITES 1600-1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER	
PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/010,973	NASH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hassan Phillips	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 January 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-63* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-63* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *05 December 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/31/02*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed on January 31, 2002, has been received and considered by the Examiner.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because the text on page 1 should be updated with the current status of the cited applications such as: "U.S. Patent Application Serial No. & Filing Date", or "U.S. Patent No. & Issue Date". Appropriate correction is required.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 16-22, 25-27, 31-39, 42- 44, 48-53, 56-58, 62, 63, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kannan U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0054064.

5. In considering claims 1 and 19, Kannan discloses in a client system and apparatus, an automated method for assisting a user of the client system in retrieving and browsing information, the method comprising: determining based at least in part on a locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed, whether to provide information browsing assistance, said locator identifying the first information page and a location from which the first information page is to be retrieved, and conditionally providing said information browsing assistance based at least in part on said determination. See page 7, paragraph 91.

6. In considering claims 2, 20, 36, and 51, Kannan teaches the locator being a uniform resource locator (URL). See page 7, paragraph 91.

7. In considering claims 3 and 21, Kannan teaches the determining comprising analyzing whether a locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

8. In considering claims 4 and 22, Kannan teaches the locator being a URL, and the determining comprising analyzing whether the URL satisfies a URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

9. In considering claim 9, Kannan further teaches downloading the URL based conditions and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications from a server system onto the client system. See page 6, paragraph 74.

10. In considering claims 10 and 25, Kannan further teaches the information browsing assistance comprising displaying a second information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

11. In considering claims 11, 26, 43, and 57, Kannan teaches the second information page effectively replacing the first information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

12. In considering claims 12, 27, 44, and 58, Kannan teaches a second information page additionally displayed complementing a first information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

13. In considering claims 16 and 31, it is inherent in the teachings of Kannan that a request to retrieve and display the first information page is received, the request including the locator. See page 2, paragraph 22.

14. In considering claims 17, 32, 48, and 62, Kannan teaches in response to said receive of a request, notifying a monitor function of a browser helper of said receipt,

(page. 2, paragraph 22); and said monitor function, in response to receipt of said notification, notifying an analyzer function of said browser helper, which performs said determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance, (page 7, paragraphs 83-84).

15. In considering claims 18, 33, and 63, Kannan teaches executing the monitor function as an extension of a browser, and executing the analyzer function external to the browser. See page 7, paragraphs 83-84.

16. In considering claim 34, Kannan teaches the apparatus being a selected one of a wireless telephone, a palm sized personal digital assistant, a notebook computer, a desktop computer, and a set top box. See Fig. 1.

17. In considering claim 35, Kannan teaches in a first server system, a method of operation comprising: receiving a request from a client system for executable instructions designed to enable the client system to conditionally provide information browsing assistance based at least in part on a locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed, said location identifying said first information page and a location from which said first information page is to be retrieved; and in response, providing said client system with said requested executable instructions. See page 2, paragraph 22.

18. In considering claim 37, Kannan teaches performing a selected one of (a) enabling the client system to determine whether a locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met, and (b) enabling the client system to provide said locator to a second server system for the second server system to determine for said client system whether a locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

19. In considering claim 38, Kannan teaches the first and second server systems being the same server system. See Fig. 5A, and Fig. 6.

20. In considering claim 39, Kannan teaches the locator being a URL; and said executable instructions designed to perform a selected one of (a) enable the client system to determine whether said URL satisfies a URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met, and (b) enable the client system to provide said URL to a second server system for the second server system to determine for said client system whether a locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

21. In considering claim 42, Kannan further teaches either (a) said executable instructions designed to enable the client system to provide said information browsing assistance by displaying a second information page or (b) the method further comprising a second server system providing said information browsing assistance to

said client system by causing a second information page to be displayed on said client system. See page 2, paragraph 25.

22. In considering claim 49, Kannan teaches either (a) said browser helper further includes said analyzer function to perform said conditional provision of information browsing assistance, in response to receipt of said notification, or (b) the method further includes a second server having said analyzer function to perform said conditional provision of information browsing assistance for said client system, in response to receipt of said notification from said client system. See page 7, paragraphs 83-84.

23. In considering claim 50, Kannan teaches a server system comprising: storage medium having stored therein at least a selected one of (a) first executable instructions designed to enable a first client system to conditionally provide information browsing assistance to itself based at least in part on a first locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed, and second executable instructions designed to provide the first client system with said first executable instructions in response to a request by the first client system for said first executable instructions, and (b) third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to conditionally provide information browsing assistance to a second client system based at least in part on a second locator of a second information page requested to be retrieved and displayed for said second client system, said first and second locators identifying said first and second information pages, and a first and a second location from which said first and

second information pages are to be retrieved respectively; and at least one processor coupled to the storage medium to execute at least one of said second and third executable instructions. See page 2, paragraph 22.

24. In considering claim 52, Kannan teaches said first executable instructions designed to enable the first client system to determine whether a first locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met, and said third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to determine for said second client system whether a second locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

25. In considering claim 53, Kannan teaches each of said first and second locators being a URL; said first executable instructions designed to enable the first client system to determine whether said first URL satisfies a first URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met; and said third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to determine for said second client system whether a second locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

26. In considering claim 56, Kannan further teaches said first executable instructions designed to enable the first client system to provide said information browsing assistance by displaying a second information page; and said third executable

instructions designed to enable the server system to provide said information browsing assistance to said client system by causing a second information page to be displayed on said client system. See page 2, paragraph 25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

27. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

28. Claims 5-8, 23, 24, 40, 41, 54, 55, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan in view of Wolfe, U.S. Patent 6,397,246.

29. In considering claims 5, 23, 40, and 54, Kannan further discloses a URL based condition comprising a pattern of URLs visited specifying a history of visited URLs, (page 7, paragraphs 83-84); and, the analysis comprising matching a URL against URL history, (page 7, paragraph 91).

Although the disclosed method taught by Kannan shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: matching the URL against URL patterns.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Wolfe teaches a method and system for processing document requests in a network comprising: a URL based condition

comprising a URL pattern specifying a family of URLs, (col. 5, lines 21-31); and, an analysis means comprising matching the URL against a plurality of URL patterns, (col. 5, lines 32-50).

Thus, given the teachings of Wolfe, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Kannan with Wolfe in order to have each URL based condition comprise a URL pattern specifying a family of URLs, and the analysis comprise matching the URL against a plurality of URL patterns. Doing so would have provided an efficient means for providing assistance specifically tailored for the user depending on URL patterns entered by the user, Wolfe, col. 4, line 49 through col. 5, line 20, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

30. In considering claims 6, 24, 41, and 55, the teachings of Wolfe provide a means for each URL pattern to comprise a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information to be provided, wherein matching comprises traversing the tree data structure. One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kannan with Wolfe to have each URL pattern comprise a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information browsing assistance to be provided, and said matching comprise traversing said tree data structure, for the same reasons indicated in consideration of claims 5, 23, 40, and 54.

31. In considering claim 7, the teachings of Kannan disclose a means for downloading the tree data structure from a server system onto the client system. See page 5, paragraph 65.

32. In considering claim 8, the teachings of Kannan disclose a means for downloading the URL patterns and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications from a server system onto the client system. See page 5, paragraph 65.

33. Claims 13, 28, 45, 59, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan in view of Peercy et al. (hereinafter Peercy), U.S. Patent 5,960,429, (Applicant Admitted Prior Art).

34. In considering claims 13, 28, 45, and 59, although the disclosed method taught by Kannan shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: the second information page comprising a plurality of locators.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Peercy teaches: displaying a plurality of locators identifying a plurality of information pages and corresponding locations from which the identified information pages are to be retrieved, (col. 1, lines 45-59).

Thus, given the teachings of Peercy, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Kannan with Peercy in order to have the second information page comprise a plurality

of locators identifying a plurality of information pages and corresponding locations from which the identified information pages of the second information page are to be retrieved. This would have provided an efficient means for giving the user a choice of popular information pages to choose from for browsing assistance, Peercy, col. 1, lines 35-41, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

35. Claims 14, 15, 29, 30, 46, 47, 60, 61, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan in view of Blumenthal, U.S. Patent 6,026,409, (see Applicant IDS).

36. In considering claims 14, 29, 46, and 60, although the disclosed method taught by Kannan shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: modifying an environment attribute of the browsing environment.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Blumenthal teaches: modifying an environment attribute of a browsing environment, (col. 5, line 50 through col. 6, line 6).

Thus, given the teachings of Blumenthal, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Kannan with Blumenthal in order to have the information browsing assistance comprise modifying an environment attribute of the browsing environment within which the determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance are performed. This would have provided an effective means for demarcating points of interest in the

browsing environment that correspond to the information browsing assistance, Blumenthal, col. 5, lines 45-47, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

37. In considering claims 15, 30, 47, and 61, Blumenthal teaches the environment attribute being an environment attribute selected from a group of environment attributes comprising a display resolution attribute, a color resolution attribute, a font selection attribute, a media player preference attribute, an add-on selection attribute, and a plug-in selection attribute. See Blumenthal, col. 5, line 50 through col. 6, line 6. One of ordinary skill in the art would modify the teachings of Kannan with Blumenthal for the reasons indicated in consideration of claims 14, 29, 46, and 60.

Conclusion

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/
2/10/05

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER